DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 534 SP 015 678

AUTHOR Howsam, Robert B.
TITLE In-Service Development in the Teaching Profession and Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Feb 79
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Chicago, IL, February 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *Degree Requirements; *Faculty Development; Inservice Teacher Education; *Organizational Change; *Professional Education; Program Development; Schools of Education; *Status Need; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; *Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

Changes in the organizational structure of teacher education and in the attitudes of members of the teaching profession are proposed. The concept of inservice teacher education is criticized as admitting that school of education graduates holding a bachelor's degree enter the profession not fully prepared and must continue to study while on the job. It is suggested that the classical hierarchical structure of business and traditional management, including assumptions about delegation, accountability, and supervision, have no place in the educational hierarchy. A parallel is drawn with business management. The teacher holding a bachelor's degree occupies a lower place in the hierarchy than does a principal holding a master's degree. This, it is argued, is a reversal of professional organization. The teacher should have the higher status since classroom teaching requires more specialized training than administration. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183534

Chicago, Illinois
February 1979

Annual Meeting of the American Association
of Colleges for Teacher Education

Section Meeting of Professional Development
in Teacher Education Faculties,
Dr. Elizabeth Jalbert, Chairperson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. B. Howsam

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

In-Service Development in the Teaching Profession and Teacher Education

by

Robert B. Howsam

A Tape Transcription

SP015678

IN-SERVICE DEVELOPMENT IN THE TEACHING PROFESSION AND TEACHER EDUCATION

by

Robert B. Howsam

AACTE, 1978

INTRODUCTION

I do -- in a way -- appreciate both the opportunity of sharing some observations on this morning session and of taking the liberty of the person who gets the microphone and expresses some ideas that he would like to test with his colleagues. It will be all to brief with respect to this morning's session. Any of us who came to the session expecting that we were going to have revealed to us -- by the opening of the clouds -- the grand and glorious worlds about faculty development would have been naive in coming and I am certain most of us at least were not.

In consequence of the circumstances that surround higher education we usually do not go away from meetings of this kind very proud of the development activities for college professors that take place in education or in other parts of the academic enterprise. So I shall put a little effort into that area. In order to preserve my own integrity however I would like also to have the privilege of some other kinds of remarks. As I undertake the latter part I ask you to forgive me if I am skeptical, pardon me if I am cynical, and to help me if I am misguided. But above all I would like to be accepted as a person who is committed, with you, to the teaching profession, and is not here for the purpose of indulging in self flagellation or criticism of others.

SECTION ONE

Perspective

The problems that we have been addressing here this morning are the problems of the profession that have been with us for the last 150 years, since Horace Mann brought the normal school to America from Europe, and, in so doing, introduced teaching as a profession to the American society. Little, I suspect, did he know how his intervention would impact teaching in this land. Little could he have predicted in his time, the mid-1830s,

what we would do to his dream and plan for quality schooling in the public school systems of Massachusetts and other states. Certainly, it has not turned out the way Horace Mann intended.

Somewhere there is an old song from my youth that has a phrase in it that says "who takes care of the caretaker's daughter while the caretaker's daughter's taking care?". Now I don't recall what the answer to that question was, and perhaps it is just as well that I do not. But if you ask who takes care of the teacher educators while the teacher educators are taking care, the answer will have to be "nobody much". Indeed, it is surprising how slowly teacher education development spreads through the teacher education community.

In recent years, we have seen some rather remarkable developments in our profession. We saw the ten Elementary Models Project of 1968-69 and the very massive documentation that that group of scholars and developers in our profession gave to us. We saw the models have a brief influence and a brief interest but they stand piled some two feet or more high on shelves relatively unreferred to these days. We saw the very exciting period of the Triple T (TTT) when more innovative things were done in teacher education in a short period of time than in all of our previous history. We saw the spawning of things like the development of Protocols so that we might all take advantage of some of the modern technologies of instruction and we have seen it, even as a phrase, disappear from our lexicon. We have seen the CBTE movement develop -- and its influence and practice still remain in some places -- but it too has lost a good deal of its thrust and it has been subverted to the competency testing movement so that now even the phrase "competency education" is not meaning a system of instruction. Rather it has become a system of terminal accountability for students throughout the land. Then we have seen the development and continuance of the Teacher Corps with all of the good things that have been done but which finds it very difficult to get over into the rest of the teacher education and university community even in those institutions which themselves host the Teacher Corps activities.

The remarkable phenomenon is the small extent to which all things of this kind are used and the extent to which those that are used are used badly or indifferently. If I had a lot of time I could give you a hundred good reasons why this is so. A reference back to the Bicentennial Commission Report provides one with clues as to why it is difficult for teacher education to do anything effectively given the set of circumstances with which it is forced to live. But in spite of that, the problem clearly still is one of dissemination, acceptance of innovation, institutionalization of innovation,

and internalization within us as teacher educators of the very idea of what good teacher education is and the kinds of things that have to be done to realize it.

The dissemination of knowledge within our field is done reasonably well. In part this is because of the constant press of the academic community to get some publications. Those things we can write about we do write about and we get into as many journals as we can. Thus, knowledge is made available. But when it comes to the rest of the process, when it comes to the action phase of getting it into programs, when it comes into the behavioral rather than the cognitive domains, many of the best practices go unused and soon forgotten. As I look at the literature, the history, and our awareness of the other professions in our society this seems markedly different from them. One thinks constantly of how quickly medical innovations spread through the medical community and how slowly ours get accepted at all. Perhaps we -- as our fellow teachers in the schools are reported to be -- perhaps we are personal-experience oriented also. That, of course, is not consistent with the notion of profession. Or perhaps we are, like so many of our academic colleagues, individualistic and primadonna-ish. Perhaps we learn the lesson of academia all too well.

Whatever the case and whatever the cause, our profession needs to have the most enlightened and the most committed and skilled college teachers that it is possible to have. We have to do as the commission report exhorted us to do. We have to be the "preparation and development arm of the teaching profession". We have to "exemplify what we explicate" on the campuses, in our own realities, and in our own behaviors. We have to be the living model of teaching and we must if we are to be the living model of teaching be the living model of learning.

Innovation and Faculty Development in Teacher Education

Really that is what we came here this morning to talk about. How do we ourselves learn? If I heard our own answers right it is that we are more concerned with our teaching than we are with our learning. Nor can it be explained just in terms of dedication. As a profession we also have to move towards much more agreement on common objectives, towards much more commonality in and use of higher order teaching strategies, and towards more effective modes for developing teaching behaviors and skills.

Professions are marked by a capacity to modify preparation and practice in light of new evidence and new inventions. Preparation programs in the other professions tend to have much in common because of this. Academics on the other hand seem reluctant to agree with or to follow anyone; they are perceived as of little worth when they try to do well what other people

have developed. The larger academic institutions at least pay little attention to innovation in instruction though they are learning a little on that lately. They support it poorly and they give it little weight in the reward structure of the institution.

Most innovations and improvements that we try to bring about in teacher education see us fighting an uphill battle. Our innovations come out of the hides and midnight oil of our professors rather than out of the planned and supported activities of our institutions. Such a process eventually wears out the individuals who themselves are attempting to bring about the innovations. I have presided over such a process with great agony. Agony over the cost to individual professors as we have sought to realize our objectives. Agony over how little general institutional approval there is for such activities and how little capacity there is to institutionalize the innovations once they have been won and to support them out of the resources of the institution. Unless the professors who are involved in the innovation have carefully tied their activities to publications -- and the demand for publications adds to wear and tear on the professor -- they get in trouble with the reward system even though they are contributing to the profession in immeasurable ways.

The innovation is usually both experimental and developmental. It is usually done with small groups of faculty and others. It usually lasts for such a short time that we cannot be sure how much of its successes was due to halo effect or hawthorne effect. Eventually it dies or gets watered down in adoption and discredited. Eventually, too, the people who have engaged in it find themselves running out of energy and tolerance. They accommodate to the system, cope with the system, and wait for some new system elsewhere to innovate. It is hard to say what the answer is; it is worth much longer discussion.

Many of these problems have been discussed by you at the tables and by the panels. I am convinced that these conditions will change only as our general professional condition changes. They will not change by our own activities on our own campus or by any amount of effort on our part to develop ourselves on the college campus. It will change only as our self-image changes in relation to our profession and to our society. It will change only in response to external support and external expectations and demands upon us. There is nothing that I can see within the institution of college or university that would securely predict the development of personnel as a valued or even tolerated and supported activity in the forseeable future. Therefore, it is, as we said in the Commission report, going to require a total profession rather than a teacher education effort. We will do well to reserve at least some of our energies for developments in those directions.

Some To Dos

I have not time here to redevelop for you the rationale of the Commission as reported in Educating a Profession. I would, however, recommend that we all urge the federal government through whatever sources it can to revisit the model teacher education program that it abandoned in the end of the 60s. In much the same way as it was done before we should develop some new models and test and implement these models. You will remember that the federal government intended in its models project to develop models in ten institutions -- nine funded by the federal government --, test the models in a number of institutions, and then report out to us those models so that we would have in concrete form what it is the best expertise of our society could give us in terms of programs of teacher education. But instead of that, scared off by something, they ran a feasibility test and dropped the whole darn business. To this day do not have anything that stands out in concrete form saying these are the things that teacher education students should know and be able to do and these are the things that will be necessary in teacher education in order to insure that. We have nothing like that to which we can turn authoritatively and say that the resources and conditions necessary for teacher education are derived from properly developed and tested teacher education models and that their justification lies in tested proof. We have yet to have such a thing anywhere in this land. We should go back and demand that that job be reintroduced and finished. Once we know what that is we would have some reason for belief that states would then support teacher education to the level necessary to approximate those models. We could have reason to believe that our accrediting associations would demand that there be an approximation of such models. Such an authortiative position would get us out of the argument back and forth amongst ourselves as to whether we need two years or three years or four years or five years to prepare teachers. It would get us out of our institutional self-protection that founders us in every attempt we make as some institutions are threatened and fear that they will lose their prerogatives if we move forward to the full dimensions of a profession.

In the meantime we should work on our own mentality of professional poverty and campus Cinderella. We should remove once for all and forever the professional deficit syndrome that characterizes our profession. We in our commission report refer to that as life space. That is, enough time and resources to prepare a teacher to full professional status before the person enters the profession.

The syndrome that we now have is that we give people some smattering of preparation and then expect somehow or other as they get out into the real world of experience they will mature and develop, learning on their own, as professional

teachers. We have one hundred and fifty years of proof that such an expectation does not work. And we have the logic of any intelligent group of people that will sit down and examine the situation. It cannot be made to work, and yet, for reasons beyond my reasonable comprehension, we continue to persist in the same self-destructive mode.

We are, like the children of poverty, taught in poverty to expect poverty. We know from the children of poverty that the only way you can get children out of that syndrome is to teach them out of it. It is the same thing with the profession that has internalized the concept that it is low in the status system in the society and university. Teacher Education is not particularly appreciated by its own profession. It is not really subscribed to by the public. Therefore, the best thing to do appears to be to sit in the chimneyplace in the ashes and attract as little attention as possible while the sisters go to the ball.

We are sending out deficit-trained teachers. Every single teacher that goes to American schools goes with a certificate of deficit rather than with a certificate of professional preparation -- every one regardless of which of our institutions. We are not close enough to the critical mass needed for any of us to claim that we are doing what should be done. We do not even have the critical mass in focus.

SECTION TWO

I now shall shift to the prerogatives I am taking. In the panel yesterday David Darland asked that we examine our assumptions in our talking and thinking about in-service education. In my perception the very theme of this conference and its entire dialogue proceeds from the assumption of semi or sub-profession status and reality. The willingness to spend a national conference on in-service education and to recognize in-service education as important attests to our acceptance of our conditions. It delays our progress. It could set us back. It is strengthening the cage or dungeon in which we long have been incarcerated. It is only within the context of the semi-profession assumption that we can even talk about in-service education for teachers. Let me repeat. It is my belief that it is only within the context of a semi-profession assumption that we can even talk about in-service education for teachers.

A Semi-Profession

There is the implicit assumption, often openly expressed, that teachers are to have a deficit preparation and go out into the schools to learn about their profession, be supervised and

directed, have their education continued in in-service throughout their career. Each element of this set of assumptions is readily derived from even superficial examination of current practice.

Since the 1976 commission report I and others have continued to study the question of teaching as a profession and how such a profession crosses the boundaries into the emerging and the newer profession categories. Thinking it through is an intriguing exercise. I have come to the conclusion that we in North America have built the whole structure of schools and teacher education on the semi-profession assumption. Not only will we have to change the assumption, we will have to revise the whole system substantially if we are ever going to escape from the trap in which we have been captured or into which we have built ourselves. In the mature professions training is complete before graduation and licensure. This training requires a relatively prolonged period of preparation which along with undergraduate education equals or exceeds six years of study after high school. On completion of the program the terminal degree for that profession is granted. Increasingly that degree is the doctorate. Witness the other professions: Doctor of Medicine; Doctor of Jurisprudence; Doctor of Optometry; Doctor of Social Work; and for teaching, if our dream that Lawrence Cremin revealed to us from the Hunt lecture platform last year were ever to be realized, the Doctor of Teaching. No higher degree is available in the other professions, in the mature professions. No higher degree is available than the first degree and nothing exceeds it in status. The professional is at the top when graduated. Neither are there any in between degrees unless the Bachelor's degree happens to be gained from the pre-professional phase of the training program in the undergirding disciplines of the profession.

Commonly in the professions the teachers in the professional schools include both professionals and scholars. PhD's in the medical sciences such as anatomy share the instructional functions with clinical professors with the MD. Commonly also the institutions which deliver professional service to clients are administered by professional administrators and these professional administrators do not come from the profession being served. In addition to the administrators, there is a well developed system of paraprofessionals who do lower order tasks thus freeing the professional from such duties and making possible a more effective use of their expertise which usually is both expensive and in short supply. The paraprofessionals within the mature professions are not on a career ladder where they rise from one level of the profession to the other. The career parts are mutually exclusive and the nurse never becomes doctor. The nature and limits of the work of para-professionals largely is controlled in the mature professions by the professionals themselves. We will all have recognized

in the medical system the nurses, the orderlies, and the other paraprofessionals as well as the law clerks who aid the professional lawyer.

Semi-professions were noted in our commission report as having several characteristics that are critical to the line of thought about professions. Number 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the characteristics of the semi-professions run like this:

(6) A tendency for the professional to identify with the employment institution more and the profession less.

(7) More subject to administrative and supervisory surveillance.

(8) Less autonomy in professional decision-making with accountability to superiors rather than to the profession.

(9) Management of organizations within which semi-professionals are employed is by persons who have themselves been prepared and have served in that profession.

Even a casual examination of these four characteristics reveals the classical hierarchical structure of business and the traditional management assumptions of delegation, accountability, and supervision. The manager has risen through the ranks and now leads and controls those of assumed lesser experience, training, talent, status, and decision-making ability.

The fit between the above characteristics and the teaching profession is apparent. The hierarchy is paralleled in the university teacher training program system. Teachers get a Bachelor's degree after four years and enter service. Immediately they are expected to show interest and commitment by continuing their preparation in a Master's degree program. There is little or no expectation that teachers as such will aspire to a Doctor's degree. Those who do will receive little economic return from their employers, and even less approval from their teacher colleagues who will often wonder what is wrong with that person with a Doctor's degree that he cannot get a better job. For supervisors and department heads the Master's degree is considered appropriate, principals customarily have the Masters plus or sixth year program, and those that aspire to the superintendency will expect to complete a six year certificate program or a Doctorate. Throughout it all a carefully concocted set of certificates keeps the specialized positions available only to those who have been program annointed. Above the hierarchy of practice and standing well apart is the education professoriate possessed as most of us are with the qualifications of a terminally degreed and licensed professional program and an academic

appointment on the college or university campus. We retreat to the prestige of academia and thus is the hierarchy complete. Teacher to supervisor to principal to superintendent to professor in a hierarchy very carefully designed and prestige related except there is one further distinction. The professional PhD, though essentially similar on most university campuses in program content, stands well ahead of the professional Doctor of Education degree.

Clearly everything we can see about the existing teaching profession indicates its present status as a semi-profession. More and more I am convinced that little progress will be made until we break the hierarchy of para-professionals within the teaching profession, elevate the teacher to be the professional equal of any, and make sure that teachers have the paramount role in the teaching profession. To do so will require the raising of the self-image and the professional pride of both the profession collectively and teachers individually. Governmental agencies, teacher's organizations, teacher educators, and local school leadership should be organized to think anew about teacher education and to conceptualize a new future and ways to move into it. To do less is to continue in place the very barriers to the solution of educational problems which have plagued us all.

Conclusion

In conclusion I should like to present some statements that to me seem self evident:

(1) Nothing is more important to a society than the quality of its educative processes.

(2) Institutions such as schools can be no better than those who serve within them.

(3) Teachers are the professionals who serve the school clients directly.

(4) To be effective teachers need to be possessed of the best body of knowledge and repertoire of behaviors and skills which the state of the teaching profession permits at that point in time and before they enter service.

(5) Teacher education is the preparation and development arm of the teaching profession. As such it should be the living example of the best known in education and it should be constantly searching fo ways to improve itself and the profession. It should exemplify what it explicates.

(6) The whole society should look to teacher education to show the way. Just as it looks to medical hospitals on the university campuses to lead the way in medicine and to be the exemplars of the best there is, so it should look to us in teacher education as living example and the best knowledge source for what our profession has to offer.

(7) The teaching profession should be strong, well organized, and aggressive in seeking to improve the competency and performance of teachers and it should include us.

Our progress will depend on the concerned parties being willing to work together and subordinate selfish interests for the larger cause. If what I have said means anything to us at all, it should really say that whatever we get at this conference that relates to in-service education should be accepted and taken home only because our present conditions mandate that we so live. But we should in leaving and checking out of the Conrad Hilton absolve ourselves of our sins. We have denied our profession once again.